

REMARKS:

1) The specification has been amended in an editorial manner to correct a few minor typographical and grammatical errors in the original text (which was essentially a literal translation of a corresponding foreign text), and to more clearly describe certain features of the invention that were disclosed in the original drawings. These amendments are all supported by the substance and the context of the original disclosure including the original drawings, and do not introduce any new matter. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

2) The claims have been amended as follows.

Claim 1 has been amended editorially for streamlining and simplification of the original claim language. Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate subject matter from original claims 2, 4 and 7, as further supported in the specification at page 4, lines 7 to 16; page 10, lines 3 to 9 and 19 to 22; and page 11, line 19 to page 12, line 2. These amendments do not introduce any new matter.

Claims 2, 4, 6 to 8 and 10 to 19 have been canceled.

The remaining claims have been amended wherever necessary for proper conformance with the amended independent claim, and for streamlining.

New claims 20 to 26 have been added. These claims recite additional features of the invention that were originally disclosed, but not expressly included in the original claims. Also, these claims have been drafted "from the ground up" as a

fresh approach at covering the inventive subject matter in a somewhat different claim style and format compared to the original claims, which were essentially a literal translation of corresponding foreign claims. The new claims are supported by the original disclosure as shown in the following table, and do not introduce any new matter.

New Claims	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Original Support	Fig.2	Fig.1	Cl.1,2; Figs.1-4; pg.4, ln.7-12; pg.10, ln.19-22; pg.11, ln.19- pg.12, ln.2	Fig.2; Cl.1	Cl.4; Fig.1; pg.4, ln.14-16; pg.10, ln.3-9	Fig.2; pg.12, ln.11-14	Fig.1

Entry and consideration of the claim amendments and the new claims are respectfully requested.

- 3) Referring to sections 1 and 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 5 remains withdrawn, but depends from elected independent claim 1. Thus, in the event claim 1 is ultimately found allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin, consider and allow the dependent withdrawn claim 5. The further withdrawn claims 8 and 11 to 19 have been canceled. The new added claims 20 to 26 are all directed to the elected Species. Thus, after the present amendment, claims 1, 3, 9 and 20 to 26 are to be examined in the elected Species, while withdrawn dependent claim 5 should be rejoined after the allowance of claim 1.

- 4) Referring to section 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner's attention is directed to the enclosed Annotated Sheet and Replacement Sheet of Fig. 3 including corrections. The inadvertent duplicated reference number "35" has been changed to --34--. Also, the lead-line of reference number "30" has been lengthened as necessary. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the drawing revisions, and to withdraw the objection.
- 5) Referring to section 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the informality pointed out by the Examiner has been corrected in the present amendment. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the disclosure.
- 6) Referring to section 6 on pages 3 to 4 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1 to 4, 6 and 7 as anticipated by US Patent 5,161,926 (Schulz) is respectfully traversed. The present invention as defined by amended claim 1 includes features that are not disclosed and would not have been suggested by Schulz, for example as follows.
- 7) In the inventive guide device according to present claim 1, a respective pair of rolling elements must be disposed adjacent to every one of the plural corner areas of the through hole of the column. As explained in the present specification, the inventive provision of a pair of rolling elements respectively adjacent to every one of the corner areas of the through hole of the column achieves an improved support of the ram and especially supports torsional forces that might arise on

the ram (see e.g. page 4, lines 7 to 12; page 10, lines 19 to 22; and page 11, line 19 to page 12, line 2).

Contrary thereto, Schulz does **NOT** disclose arranging a pair of rolling elements adjacent to every one of the corner areas of the opening or hole of the column. Instead, Schulz provides a pair of rolling elements (16, 16, 17, 25) adjacent to two corner areas near the "bottom" of Fig. 2, but does not provide pairs of rolling elements adjacent to two other corner areas near the "top" of Fig. 2. Thus, this feature of present claim 1 is not disclosed, and claim 1 is not anticipated.

Furthermore, the arrangement of a pair of rolling elements at every one of plural corner areas of the through hole of the column as presently claimed would not have been obvious from the disclosure of Schulz. Namely, Schulz purposely provides a three-point support arrangement that includes a pair of fixed rolling elements (16, 16) at one corner area, a pair of a fixed rolling element (17) and an adjustable rolling element (25) at another corner area, and a further individual adjustable rolling element (24) at a flat face of the ram opposite the two corner areas.

The prior art arrangement does not and could not include pairs of rolling elements at all of the corner areas. Namely, this arrangement is purposely and necessarily provided by Schulz, in order to allow the position of the ram to be adjusted in two directions relative to the column, using only two adjustable rolling elements (24, 25) (see Abstract; col. 1, line 34 to col. 2, line 9; col. 3, lines 25 to 32 and 50 to 55; etc.). In order to achieve the intended adjustability as taught by Schulz, a

person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated or enabled to arrange a respective pair of rolling elements adjacent to every one of the plural corner areas of the through hole of the column as presently claimed, because that would have been directly contrary to and inoperative with respect to the express teachings and requirements of Schulz.

- 8) Further according to present claim 1, the inventive guide device has a respective longitudinal groove formed in each of the flat portions of the column bounding the through hole. Each of these longitudinal grooves extends parallel to the axial direction and penetrates through the column in the axial direction. As explained in the present specification, the provision of such a continuous axial through groove penetrating the inner wall of the column in the axial direction facilitates a simplified manufacturing of the column because it is easy to mill or otherwise form such a continuous through groove (see e.g. page 4, lines 14 to 16 and page 10, lines 3 to 9 of the present specification).

Contrary thereto, Schulz does **NOT** disclose a longitudinal groove that is formed in a flat portion of the column bounding the through hole of the column, whereby the longitudinal groove extends parallel to the axial direction and penetrates through the column in the axial direction. Instead, Schulz discloses only respective individual bearing housing holes formed in individual block-shaped bearing holders (e.g. 28, 34, 38), which are provided only directly adjacent to the open ends of the through hole of the column (see Figs. 2 and 3). Thus, the

inventive provision of a longitudinal groove penetrating through the column in the axial direction in the inner wall or flat portion thereof is not disclosed, and claim 1 is not anticipated.

Furthermore, the present arrangement would not have been suggested by Schulz, because it would not have made sense in the context of the individual block-shaped bearing holders that are secured to the column (14) according to Schulz. Furthermore, Schulz expressly explains why the bearing holders (and the associated rolling elements) should be spaced rather far apart from one another and thus arranged at the open ends of the through hole of the column (see e.g. col. 1, lines 42 to 47 and col. 3, lines 25 to 32). That would have provided a motivation and suggestion against (and no need for) a longitudinal groove extending axially in a flat inner wall and penetrating through the column in the axial direction.

- 9) For the above reasons, the invention of present independent claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor would have been obvious over the disclosure of Schulz. The dependent claims are patentably distinguishable already due to their dependence. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 to 4, 6 and 7 as anticipated by Schulz.
- 10) Referring to section 8 on page 4 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 as obvious over Schulz in view of US Patent 5,711,611 (Nagai et al.) is respectfully traversed. The Examiner has cited Nagai et al. (in combination with Schulz) with regard to the provision of an oil retaining member. Even

if such an oil retaining member would have been provided in the arrangement according to Schulz, the significant inventive features of present independent claim 1 (as discussed above) would not have been suggested. Thus, even a combination of Nagai et al. with Schulz would not have made present claim 9 obvious, because claim 9 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection for obviousness over Schulz in view of Nagai et al.

- 11) New claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features that the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider in comparison to the prior art.
- 12) New independent claim 22 has been drafted from the ground up as a fresh approach at covering important features of the invention. In view of the above discussion of the prior art, and especially a comparison of the present invention to the disclosure of Schulz, it should be seen that claim 22 is also patentably distinguishable over the prior art. For example, as discussed above, Schulz neither discloses nor would have suggested the arrangement of a respective pair of roller elements at each respective corner area of the through hole of the column. This is also a significant feature of present claim 22. The new dependent claims 23 to 26 recite additional features that further distinguish the invention over the prior art.

- 13) Referring to section 9 on page 4 of the Office Action, the additional prior art made of record requires no particular comments because it has not been applied against the claims.
- 14) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 20 to 26, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Masanori MOCHIZUKI
Applicant

WFF:ar/4272
Enclosures: postcard,
Letter to Draftsman,
1 Replacement Sheet of
Fig. 3,
1 Annotated Sheet of
Fig. 3

By Walter F. Fasse
Walter F. Fasse
Patent Attorney
Reg. No.: 36132
Tel. 207-862-4671
Fax. 207-862-4681
P. O. Box 726
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail, in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Walter F. Fasse 4/27/04
Name: Walter F. Fasse - Date: April 27, 2004